

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

LIONRA TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

FORTINET, INC.,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 2:22-CV-00322-JRG-RSP

ORDER


Plaintiff Liorna Technologies Ltd. previously filed motions for partial summary judgment (Dkt. No. 258, 262) and Defendant Fortinet, Inc. previously filed motions for partial summary judgment (Dkt. Nos. 259, 260, 261) and a motion to reconsider (Dkt. No. 554). Magistrate Judge Payne entered a Reports and Recommendations (Dkt. No. 479, 480, 482, 542, 579, 580) on these motions. Lionra and Fortinet have now filed various Objections (Dkt. No. 508, 549, 553, 598).

After conducting a *de novo* review of the briefing on these motions, the Reports and Recommendations, and the briefing on the parties Objections, the Court agrees with the reasoning provided within the Reports and Recommendations and concludes that the Objections fail to show that the Reports and Recommendations were erroneous. Consequently, the Court **OVERRULES** the parties' Objections and **ADOPTS** the Reports and Recommendations and orders:

- the Partial Summary Judgment to Enforce *Sotera* Stipulations (Dkt. No. 258) is **DENIED**
- the Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §101 (Dkt. No. 259) is **DENIED** and the Motion for Summary Judgment of No Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 (Dkt. No. 262) is **GRANTED**

- the Motion for Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement (Dkt. No. 260) is **DENIED**
- the Motion regarding License, or in the Alternative, Non-Infringement (Dkt. No. 261) is **GRANTED** but that the subsequently requested relief is **DENIED**.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 28th day of August, 2024.



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE